

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Working Group
for
Executive Committee for Highway Safety
Meeting Minutes; Mtg. #6
May 10, 2007**

Location:

NCDOT Large Conference Room, Room 280, 401 Oberlin Road @ 9:00 a.m.

Working Group Members in Attendance:

Greg Brew	Jeff Cox	James Dunlop	Vickie Embry
Jason Galloway	Frank Hackney	Brad Hibbs	Daniel Keel
Margaret Landon	Greg Loy	Mary Meletiou	Jimmy Newkirk
Tom Norman	Sarah O'Brien	Pete Schubert	

Guests in Attendance:

Roger Ballard	Joel Cranford	Patricia Driggers	Lanier McRee
Pam Pope	David Salvesen	Lori Schneider	

Working Group Members Absent:

Timothy Akers	Loretta Barren	Cliff Braam	Tyler Meyer
Charlie Zegeer			

Scribe:

Jeff Cox

New Action Items:

- 1. Mary Meletiou to continue development for the Law Enforcement Education and ensure inclusion of a curriculum in the 2009 Mandated In-Service Training for Law Enforcement.**
- 2. Pedestrian Policy Committee to meet to continue to develop primary elements and identify reasons to change NCDOT's policy.**

Ongoing Subcommittees

- DMV Drivers Handbook subcommittee: Mary Meletiou (Chair), Tim Akers, Margaret Landon, Frank Hackney, and Pete Schubert.
- Law Enforcement Education subcommittee: Tim Akers (Chair), Mary Meletiou, Margaret Landon, Frank Hackney, and Pete Schubert.
- Subcommittee to propose strategy to Executive Committee to broaden Pedestrian Policy: Greg Brew (Chair), Vickie Embry, Daniel Keel, Mary Meletiou, Tom Norman, Charlie Zegeer.
- Subcommittee to develop resolution on school site selection: Greg Loy (Chair), Jeff Cox, Mary Meletiou, Pete Schubert, and Sarah Worth.

Minutes:

- The meeting began at approximately 9:00 a.m.

Task I – Welcome

Tom opened the meeting and welcomed everyone.

Task II – Introductions

Tom introduced:

Pam Pope – Training Manager, North Carolina Justice Academy

Roger Ballard – Architect, Department of Public Instruction

David Salvesen – Center for Urban Regional Studies

Jason Galloway – Signals and Geometrics Unit, Traffic Engineering Branch, NCDOT

Task III – Status of Bike/Ped Working Group Strategies --

1. Law Enforcement Education

Pam Pope spoke on the process of having a curriculum added to the Mandated In-Service Training for Law Enforcement.

- In 2005, all law enforcement officers working for city police departments and state agencies were required to complete 24 hours of mandated training.
- In 2006, all law enforcement officers certified by the State of North Carolina must complete 24 hours of mandated training.
- The North Carolina Justice Academy has been tasked with the responsibility of working with the Criminal Justice Education & Training Standards Commission and the Sheriffs' Education & Training Standards Commission on determining the topics to be covered during a given year of training, the hours that are to be associated with the same, and then developing the entire training package for distribution.
- The above named Commissions authorized a sub-committee on In-Service training to determine what topic, topical hours and training objectives should be covered. This sub-committee is comprised of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs, as well as members of the Criminal Justice Education & Training Standards Division and Sheriffs' Education & Training Standards Division who regulate certification. The Justice Academy staffs this committee as well, but we are not members.
- The Joint In-Service Training subcommittee (Chiefs of Police and Sheriffs) meets in the late fall to determine the training that will occur two years hence. For instance, the subcommittee met in late October 2006 to discuss the training for 2008.
- After the In-Service sub-committee decides on the topics, the Justice Academy reports to the appropriate Commissions the proposed topics for their approval. The meeting normally occurs in November/December.
- The Joint sub-committee then meets in January and provides approval of the training objectives which will then be presented to the appropriate Commission for approval. The Justice Academy is responsible for the development of the training objectives.
- Please refer to the handout "2008 Timeline Development" for additional information.

Based on her presentation, it appears that the best we can do is get on the 2009 curriculum.

There is a deadline to have all materials ready for the curriculum by late June 2008.

There will need to be a presentation given to the Joint Subcommittee in October 2007. This subcommittee is lead by Bill Hogan of Asheville and Steve Bunn of Bladen County. The presentation should have a compelling argument for module inclusion and should be around 10 minutes. It should be backed up with good statistics and be presented in good format.

Mary Meletiou question whether everyone would take this or would there be a department choice.

Pam said that Sheriffs do not necessarily use curriculum as written. CJ must use curriculum.

In most cases, 8 hours is left to departmental choice. Most use the curriculums provided.

October meeting: How many votes and who are they? Pam said there are 4 or 5 Sheriffs and 7 or 8 Chiefs on the In-Service Committee. She will provide the names.

How it works:

- Chairs open floor for suggestions, but may have suggestions of their own that they may use.
- We should contact the Chairs.

Frank said to mention that this proposed curriculum is approved by the ECHS.

Pam said to come prepared with Training Objectives. Mary is assigned.

Peter asked "What are training objectives?"

Pam explained that her office teaches how to prepare objectives. Remember your target audience, Cops, and what they need to know?

Frank said that some officers do not know about the helmet law.

Margaret said we can consider a 2 hour course for mandated curriculum or a 4 hour curriculum for department choice.

Jim mentioned that there are specialized courses for Traffic, Traffic Crash Investigations and that we should pursue at different levels.

Margaret asked about Academy Trainers travelling to remote areas.

This can happen. Cooperating remote agencies would help to "fill the room".

Peter said that certified law enforcement officers covers all Law Enforcement: Chiefs, SBI, ALE, Sheriffs' Deputies.... 30,000 plus.

Thanks to Pam.

2. *School Site Selection*

David Salvesen - School site selection is very complicated with many sometimes conflicting issues to sort through.

Trends – Schools are getting bigger. High Schools are typically around 84 acres and elementary schools around 36 acres.

Accepted formula today is start at 10 acres for elementary, 20 acres for middle, and 30 acres for high schools and then add an acre for each 100 students.

Schools are moving away from the people they serve.

This issue generates interest from many directions:

Neighborhood schools

Public Health – promotes walking

Smart Growth – smaller neighborhood schools (issue – segregation / diversity)

Supreme Court – has two cases that may challenge assignment based on race.

School Choice – some districts offer choice (magnets) that cross sub-district lines. This brings up the issue of lost community opportunity.

Stranger Danger – Parents are concerned their walking children may encounter predators, etc.

Infrastructure – no sidewalk facilities, no bike racks and other safety features.

Security concerns have caused schools to become enclosed camps with few entrances/exits.

Must overcome parental concerns in this area.

Other issues-

Fragmentation of governments – Schools must scramble to find a site to meet demands of new developments that are approved by other government agencies.

Florida has state-mandated local planning – local governments must sign inter-local agreements – now being enforced through school concurrency – developer must find out about available capacity in schools to get approval for their development.

Wake County is looking at alternative sites – old office building – old Winn-Dixie grocery store – old pharmaceutical plant.

Four counties were unaware that site size guidelines are not requirements any longer.

Schools can be built in more densely developed areas: Glendale School in Chapel Hill/Carrboro.

Model School Designs

- Bring all stakeholders to table –
- Get a good architect – particularly with renovations.
- Give planning committees adequate time.
- Question rules that don't make sense, eg. CharMeck buffer between school and recreational areas. Davidson requirement for bricks on "learning cottages".
- Push for good design – natural lighting, etc.
- Build community-centered schools, eg. In St. Paul there is a school and YMCA built adjacent to each other. This helps to build parental support for the school.
- Walkable schools means walkable neighborhoods.
- Better collaboration between governments and schools.
- Perception vs. Reality about Security.
- Trade-offs – Walking vs. Diversity.

But we must remember that some schools are just in bad locations and students there should not be encouraged to walk to school.

Joel Cranford, Municipal and School Transportation Assistance Engineer (invited by Jim Dunlop) said he is starting to see the trend in NC for smaller schools. He's also seeing

some schools going to multilevel design (more compact). Kindergarten and First Graders cannot go to second floor.

Some elementary and middle schools have pods with restrooms that can increase number of students. (A result of Katrina cottage concept translating to some schools in CharMeck.

Roger said that Wake County is using “mega-modulars.”

Joel offered additional things that affect walking to school: Schools are going to magnet programs. Year round vs. traditional schools. Diversity. School Academic Ratings.

Rural areas are not good for walkable schools because subdivisions do not have sidewalk. But there should at least be a plan for sidewalks around schools.

Joel feels that the school siting process is hampered by the view that many officials hold that DOT slows down the process and should not be involved in the decision making process. But DOT is still blamed about traffic problems that arise at new school sites. His unit provides comments to those counties and districts that ask for input.

David mentioned the issue of building schools on high-volume highways. He said visibility is important to some districts.

Some subdivisions are using the neighborhood clubhouse as a bus stop to get kids across the street to school. Liability becomes an issue here.

Roger Ballard mentioned a website for reference: www.schoolclearinghouse.org. He said that architects should remember that the Guidelines on school size are no longer requirements.

Patricia – Social issues involved – school bus is perceived as demeaning

David – megaschool trend may have already peaked. Large forces are pushing toward smaller schools, eg. Bill Gates Foundation

Patricia – Smaller schools are perceived to have a better capacity to identify problems in the school at an earlier stage.

Next Steps: We still need to get educated. We don’t want to reinvent the wheel. Our goal is reduction in bike/ped fatalities and injuries. Trend is a generation of kids who have been motored wherever they go. All Stakeholders need to be involved.

3. *DMV Handbook*

Mary reported that no progress has been made.

4. *NCDOT Pedestrian Policy*

Broadening policy will be done at a measured pace.

5. *School Zones – Reduce Speeding*

Mary introduced Lanier McRee, her new assistant at ITRE.

Mary said that Fayetteville ticketed speeders in school zones but that appears to have little or no difference in driver behavior.

Ticket cost is \$50.

Considering broadening strategy to include education in addition to enforcement.

We will consider action at the next meeting.

6. *Implementation Guide Strategy – Tom Norman*

This strategy is not a priority now. May look at after other accomplishments.

Task– Next Meeting Date

Our next meeting will be in the Large Conference Room at 401 Oberlin Road at 9:00 on Thursday, August 9th.

The meeting was adjourned at noon.